

**TOWN OF GILBERT
PLANNING COMMISSION STUDY SESSION
GILBERT MUNICIPAL CENTER, 50 E. CIVIC CENTER DRIVE, GILBERT ARIZONA
SEPTEMBER 2, 2015**

COMMISSION PRESENT: Chairman Joshua Oehler
Vice Chairman Kristofer Sippel
Commissioner David Cavenee
Commissioner Brent Mutti
Commissioner David Blaser
Commissioner Carl Bloomfield
Commissioner Jennifer Wittmann
Alternate Brett Young

COMMISSION ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Planning Services Manager Linda Edwards
Principal Planner Catherine Lorbeer
Senior Planner Bob Caravona
Assistant Town Engineer, Eliana Hayes

ALSO PRESENT: Town Council Member Brigitte Peterson
Town Attorney Jack Vincent
Recorder Margo Fry

CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Joshua Oehler called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m.

Z15-13: LAKEVIEW TRAILS AT MORRISON RANCH: REQUEST TO AMEND ORDINANCE NOS. 1129, 1232, 1514, 1602, 1705, 1961, 2219, 2295, 2438 AND 2450 AND REZONE APPROXIMATELY 229.5 ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY WITHIN THE MORRISON RANCH PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT (PAD), GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF RECKER ROAD AND MESQUITE STREET FROM APPROXIMATELY 67.1 ACRES OF SINGLE FAMILY-6 (SF-6), 124.8 ACRES OF SINGLE FAMILY-7 (SF-7), AND 46.6 ACRES OF SINGLE FAMILY-8 (SF-8) ZONING DISTRICT WITH A PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY TO APPROXIMATELY 70.5 ACRES OF SINGLE FAMILY-6 (SF-6), 47.1 ACRES OF SINGLE FAMILY-7 (SF-7), 64.8 ACRES OF SINGLE FAMILY-8 (SF-8), AND 57.1 ACRES OF SINGLE FAMILY-10 (SF-10) ZONING DISTRICT WITH A PLANNED DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY.

Senior Planner Bob Caravona displayed a map showing the location of the vacant parcel located Northeast of Higley Road and E. Warner Rd. The illustrative plan was laid over the parcel to give an idea as to how the layout is to occur. There are a variety of lot sizes from SF-6, SF-7, SF-8, and SF-10 which is going to create a more unique neighborhood than was previously proposed. The General Plan is a density range of R<2-3.5 and R<3-5.5. At the low-end density range within the development, they could build 580 units. At the high end they could produce a plan that would create 940 units. With the illustrative plan they are proposing 660 lots. An exhibit was displayed of the existing zoning and it was noted that they are very large tracts, close to 48 acres in size. The proposed plan will add a little more diversity in terms of lot size through the addition of SF-10 which is introduced in 3 different sections. An exhibit was displayed of the proposed configuration of the project. The integrity of the north-south access roads was maintained as well as the east-west access. They are reshaping the lots within the zoning districts and in between the streets. The open space is maintained as originally proposed. There is a reduction of 73 lots between the two

Planning Commission
Study Session 9-2-15

designs while there is the same green space configuration of linkages and park amenities as previous. There are landscape tracts along the arterials and the ends of blocks. There is a setback request from arterials and commercial properties. Planner Caravona referred to the information in the following graph from page 3 of the staff report:

ALLOCATION OF GROSS ACREAGE BY ZONING DISTRICT					
EXISTING ZONING			PROPOSED ZONING		
Zoning District / Parcels	Total Gross Acreage	%	Zoning District / Parcels	Total Gross Acreage	%
Single Family-6 (SF-6) / Parcels A and C	67.1	28.0	Single Family-6 (SF-6) / Parcel C and I	70.5	29.4
Single Family-7 (SF-7) / Parcel B, D, F	124.8	52.1	Single Family-7 (SF-7) / Parcel A and G	47.1	19.7
Single Family-8 (SF-8) / Parcel E	46.6	19.5	Single Family-8 (SF-8) / Parcel D and F	64.8	27.1
West Boundary Adjustment	1	0.4	Single Family-10 (SF-10) / Parcel B, E and H	57.1	23.8
TOTAL	239.5	100%		239.5	100%

The applicant requests a reduction in side yard setbacks from 10' and 5' to 9' and 6' for parcels zoned Single Family-6 and Single Family-7. The 6' and 9' configuration is also found in other communities within the Town, for example Bridges. The 6' and 9' enables a more balanced approach in terms of setbacks and you get a greater distance at the low-end if you have two 6' sideyard setbacks, next to each other, which provides 12' separation between the homes. With 9' setbacks, you would be 18' but you would still have a more balanced approach in appearance. The 2nd request is to add a new zone district which is SF-10. Those setbacks are consistent with the approved Morrison Ranch development standards. In addition, there is a request to reduce the front yard stagger from 5' to 3' which is consistent with the LDC. The 3' stagger is a departure from Morrison Ranch standards; however, this is a unique neighborhood unto itself. There is also a request for reduction for the side lots siding onto arterial streets and commercial uses. After staff's research the request seems unnecessary at this point but staff would work with the developer as they reviewed the preliminary plat to see where the condition exists and where it may be needed. Planner Caravona indicated on the site map where the arterials, interior roads and commercial space were located.

Commissioner Wittmann commented that there were not many times when they see a developer come back in and ask for a reduction in density on their own parcel. She said that she liked what the developer was doing and that it would be a great addition to the community.

Overview of Capital Improvement Plan

Assistant Town Engineer, Eliana Hayes stated that she would be presenting the basics of the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), the newly adopted CIP and the development of the next CIP. In June 2015, Town Council adopted the fiscal year 2016 – 2025 CIP which went into effect on July 1, 2015. The CIP is a financial planning tool identifying the resources needed to address the infrastructure needs that have been identified through that planning. The first year of that CIP is the expenditure authorization for that fiscal year which we are in currently. For the newly adopted CIP, \$1.7 billion of infrastructure and improvements

have been identified with the bulk of those projects being in the parks – recreation open space and streets category. That is with 16% of that money going towards water, 7% wastewater and 12% of that money is being made up with public safety, redevelopment municipal facilities type projects and traffic control. Another way to look at those infrastructure needs is also by a heat map justification. Ms. Hayes indicated the map and pointed out the geographical distribution of those monies per project type. Monies are being spent Gilbert wide as identified in the CIP with types of projects like the water rights projects which are in the CIP. Examples of the types of projects that they currently have in the Capital Improvement Plan include; the Santan Water Treatment Plant expansion as well as the Greenfield Wastewater Reclamation Facility expansion projects that are part of the Integrated Water Resources Master Plan for Parks and Recreation in those open space type projects. There are extensions of numerous trails throughout Gilbert as well as a brand-new park for Chandler Heights Basin. For transportation they have the widening of existing corridors and intersections as well as the new TI at the 202 and Lindsay. Another type of project infrastructure improvement that will be seen in a CIP is those that are rehabilitative in nature. Those come from the long-range infrastructure plan that the operating groups develop. Those plans identify a regular maintenance routine schedule for those infrastructures and at some point that routine maintenance no longer is effective and complete reconstruction of that infrastructure becomes the cost-effective approach. Projects that represent those types of projects are streetlight replacement projects that are currently going into the Val Vista subdivision, streetlight replacement projects along Baseline and Higley and some distribution water line replacements. There are wastewater pump station reconstruction projects in the CIP as well as replacement of park amenities. The current fiscal year of the Capital Improvement Plan is the expenditure authorization to get moving with the infrastructure improvements. For this fiscal year 2016 the capital group is responsible for approximately \$70 million of infrastructure improvement with the majority of those coming under water followed by wastewater, streets and then parks. Looking at that growth versus the rehabilitative reconstruction they are pretty much on par with one another. In terms of more information as to where they are at with those improvements that they are currently responsible for in this fiscal year and those that have carried forward from last year, you can go to the town's website where there is a Gilbert CIP map which is kept up-to-date on a monthly basis. That will break out the different categories of projects that they are currently working on. Selecting a specific project will tell you the project ID, the fiscal year that it was first initiated the project manager and project scope and the status of the project and the project's budget. Ms. Hayes noted that they are now working on the development of the next CIP which was adopted in June 2015. At the very onset the operating group identifies the infrastructure needs and the source of the need and whether it is a growth related project, is it in the Master Plan, is it a LRIP type project where it is come to its lifespan and they need to look at replacing it. They are also responsible for identifying the potential scope of what needs to be done or if there are any assumptions or concerns which could impact the timing of the project. They are also responsible for identifying any timing constraints for any stakeholders that they should be informing or coordinating with. The CIP group validates and refines all the information that is given to them and then goes through and coordinates those projects not only among the different operating groups but so the water department can see what streets projects they are looking at moving forward with so they can identify any type of utility infrastructure that they should be considering as they move forward with the street project. They also set up meetings with Planning to see if they are aware of any developments that could possibly push forward the timing of some of the infrastructure improvements as well. The kickoff was in August and the stakeholders have been working for a month to identify all of their information and in the middle of September they will be submitting their information to the CIP group who will be doing their portion of the work as well as coordinating with the different stakeholders. Once the projects are identified and refined they are turned over to the office of Management and Budget where they start working up the financials of those projects. At the start of the New Year it goes over to the executive team where they start prioritizing those projects and where they begin preparing the recommendation that will be presented to Town Council. That process begins in May for the approval and adoption with the final adoption in June. Currently, the public input that they foresee happening for the new CIP development would be the stakeholder meeting to happen towards the end of April and then the public hearings as it moves through Council for final adoption.

Vice Chairman Sippel asked if the map that was shown was on the Town website.

Ms. Hayes said that it was on Gilbert's home page.

Discussion of regular meeting agenda

Vice Chairman Sippel stated that the agenda would stay as presented.

Open Meeting Law Training

Chairman Oehler announced that the Open Meeting Law Training would be presented to the Commission after the close of the Public Hearing.

Chairman Oehler recessed the Study Session at 5:55 p.m.

Chairman Oehler reconvened the Study Session at 6:15 p.m.

Town Attorney Jack Vincent presented the Open Meeting Law Training to the Planning Commission.

ADJOURN MEETING

Study Session Meeting adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

Chairman Joshua Oehler

ATTEST:

Recorder Margo Fry